

Application No. 10/673,514

Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2006 and the Advisory Action dated April 4, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet, which includes Fig. 3, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are presently active; Claims 20-49 have been withdrawn by a Restriction Requirement, and Claims 1, 5, 13, 14, and 19 have been presently amended.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected due to informalities. Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 5, 13, 14, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-3, 5, and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jap. Pat. Appl. Pub. 08-031753 to Tashiro et al. Claims 4, 6-8, and 13-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tashiro et al in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0151372 to Tsuchiya et al. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchiya et al in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,441,596 to Nulty.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Arancibia to provide a detailed explanation of her position with regard to the amendment filed March 27, 2006. In light of this understanding of Examiner Arancibia's position, Applicants wish to point out that the claims as filed herewith clarify that the first RF signal and the second RF signal are applied from the same RF source.

Applicants submit that such a plasma ignition process is not disclosed or suggested by Tashiro et al. In Figure 1 of Tashiro et al, there exists one electrode 110 to which two RF power supplies 114 and 15 are connected. There are clearly two separate RF power supplies connected to electrode 110 in Tashiro et al such that the disclosed RF RF and VHF RF signals come from respective ones of the two RF power supplies 114 and 15.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over Tashiro et al.

Regarding the objection to the drawings and the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections, the present amendment resubmits those changes identified in the Advisory Action as having overcome those deficiencies. Thus, the objection to the drawings and the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections are believed to have been overcome.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouh
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 32,829

Ronald A. Rudder
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number

22850

Attachments: Letter Submitting Replacement Drawing(s), Replacement Sheet (1)

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\243294US\RESPONSE2-TO-OA-01252006.DOC